



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,452	05/02/2005	Ariel Peled	29837	4135
67801 7590 12/23/2009 MARTIN D. MOYNIHAN d/b/a PRTSI, INC. P.O. BOX 16446 ARLINGTON, VA 22215				
EXAMINER				
LIN, KENNY S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2452				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/23/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/533,452

**Applicant(s)**

PELED ET AL.

**Examiner**

Kenny S. Lin

**Art Unit**

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-357 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-357 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/28/06, 7/21/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-357 are presented for examination.

***Election/Restrictions***

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-175, drawn to network information monitoring, classified in class 709, subclass 224.
  - II. Claims 176-336 and 344-354, drawn to information identification method, classified in class 707, subclass 6.
  - III. Claims 337-343 and 355, drawn to method for automated computerized exchange of information within an information object having overall coherency, classified in class 707, subclass 201.
  - IV. Claims 356-357, drawn to apparatus for identifying information for controlling use of information object, classified in class 707, subclass 205.
3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as deducing information about the content of the information objects. Group II has separate utility such as identifying the identity of the information objects. Group III has separate utility such as exchanging of information

within an information object having overall coherency. Group IV has separate utility such as deducing information about the identity of the information objects and using the identity for controlling use of the information object. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include**

**(i) an election of a invention to be examined** even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) **and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

For Group I:

Species 1, claims 5-6, 9-22, 91-98, 102-107, 117-121, 123-125, 169, 173-175.

(process of assigning elementary information unit identifier)

Species 2, claims 29-34.

(carrying out proxy on remote proxy unit)

Species 3, claims 38-53, 55, 59-66, 71, 76-77, 90, 111, 122, 159, 163-168, 170-172.

(various implementation of information object policy)

Species 4, claim 54.

(deducing utilizing conditional probabilities)

Species 5, claims 56-58.

(deducing utilizing keywords)

Species 6, claims 69-70, 72-74.

(utilizing organizational structure information)

Species 7, claim 75.

(making use of user interface)

Species 8, claims 78-89.

(using template information objects)

Species 9, claims 112-116.

(stage of discerning lifecycle information)

Species 10, claims 126-128.

(processing monitoring and controlling of a client)

Species 11, claims 129-136.

(comparing of information objects to calculate similarity and differences)

Species 12, claim 138.

(extracting a descriptor of information object)

Species 13, claim 141.

(interfacing an information management system and document management system)

Species 14, claims 142-145.

(tracking patterns)

Species 15, claims 146-150.

(logging)

Species 16, claims 151-157.

(assessing the integrity of information objects)

Species 17, claim 158.

(defining and the processing of ignored information objects)

Species 18, claims 160.

(not allowing usage of information objects)

Species 19, claims 161.

(not allowing storage of information objects)

Species 20, claims 162.

(not allowing distribution of information objects)

Species 21, claims 169, 173-175.

(locating information object with similar contents)

Claim 1-4, 78, 23-28, 35-37, 67-68, 18-110, 137 are generic for subcombination Group I.

For Group II:

Species 1, claims 179-196, 252-259, 263-268, 278-282, 284, 285-286, 330, 334-335.

Species 2, claims 199-214, 216, 220-227, 232, 237-238, 251, 272, 283, 320, 324-329.

Species 3, claim 215.

Species 4, claims 217-219.

Species 5, claims 230-231, 233-235.

Species 6, claim 236.

Species 7, claims 239-250.

Species 8, claims 260-262.

Species 9, claims 273-277.

Species 10, claims 287-289.

Species 11, claims 290-297.

Species 12, claim 299.

Species 13, claim 302.

Species 14, claims 303-306.

Species 15, claims 321-318.

Species 16, claim 319.

Species 17, claim 321.

Species 18, claim 322.

Species 19, claim 323.



Species 20, claim 330, 334-336.

(The species for Group II are defined according to the reasons of Group I)

Claim 176-178, 181-182, 197-198, 228-229, 269-271, 298, 300-301 are generic for subcombination Group II.

6. The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1-4, 78, 23-28, 35-37, 67-68, 18-110, 137 are generic for subcombination Group I. Claim 176-178, 181-182, 197-198, 228-229, 269-271, 298, 300-301 are generic for subcombination Group II.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

**Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including**

any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

### ***Conclusion***

7. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire **One MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kenny S Lin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452  
December 23, 2009